

**United States District Court, Eastern District of Washington**  
**Magistrate Judge Alexander C. Ekstrom**  
**Richland**

**USA v. FAROOQ S. YASEEN**

**Case No. 4:21-CR-6042-MKD-19**

**Detention Review Hearing:**

**03/14/2023**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sara Gore, Courtroom Deputy  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> George Jacobs, US Atty               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Erica Helms, US Probation / Pretrial Services (tele)                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Christopher Black, Defense Atty      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant present <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> in custody USM | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interpreter – Amine El Fajri (video) |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> Defendant not present / failed to appear        |
- 
- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Defendant continued detained | <input type="checkbox"/> Conditions of Release imposed      |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> 199C Advice of Penalties/Sanctions |

**REMARKS**

Court advises the parties of his authority to hear the detention hearing (rule 3142F). Defendant had a previous detention hearing in another district.

Government has no objection to proceeding with the detention review hearing.

Defense counsel argued why there are conditions which justify reconsidering the issues of detention and that such conditions will reasonably assure Defendant's appearance as required. Defense counsel argues the Defendant has been in jail for two months and has no criminal history and has never been in custody. Defense counsel argues Defendant has ties to the community and would like to be released to live with his brother. Defendant is not a flight risk, no criminal history, flew back into the states to address the charges. Defendant was in a foreign country when the charges were indicted, he did not flee after the charges were Indicted. Defense counsel argues the government has not met the burden. Defense counsel argued conditions of release with GPS home monitoring and possible bail.

Colloquy between Court and counsel regarding alleged threats – doesn't/does make since.

Government argues the severity of the case, Defendant alone scheme includes over \$500,000.00 in staged accidents. Defendant's involvement in more than one staged accident. Government argues the Defendant knew he had a warrant and didn't return to the states until 2023.

Government argued that there are no conditions which justify reconsidering the issues of detention or that there are no conditions which will reasonably assure Defendant's appearance as required and/or the safety of any other person and the community. Government argues Defendant is a flight risk and no conditions to ensure the Defendant would appear.

Colloquy between Court and counsel regarding document given to Magistrate Judge in the Western District.

Discussion between Court and Defense counsel regarding citizenship of Iraq and Turkey.

Rebuttal argument by Defense counsel.

**The Court ordered:**

1. Government's Motion for Detention is **granted**.
2. The Court ruled that it will abide by Western District earlier determination.
3. The Court ruled that there are no conditions which justify reconsidering the issue of bail or that there are conditions of release which will reasonably assure Defendant's appearance as required.
4. Defendant shall be detained by the U.S. Marshal until further order of the Court.